

# MORE ON THE FALKLANDS

## 1. Insane Disproportionality

Political spectrum on the Falkland War grows curiously and curiously. While ordinarily dovish liberals like Mary McGrory whoop it up for Britain and Empire, the ultra-hawk Patrick J. Buchanan has been a model of rationality. In an attack of good sense and rationality, Buchanan has been asking, in his columns, for God's sake how many thousands will have to die and how many billions wasted in order to give to the 1800 kelpers the flag they love? As Buchanan asks (May 21), "Assume it is the wish of the Falklanders to live, forever, under a British flag. What price should London pay, what price can Britain afford, to meet those desires?"

If he were a libertarian and an anarchist, Buchanan might press on. For, even apart from the imperialist aspects of the war, the minarchist view that the "government should provide defense" runs afoul of a problem they never answer. For "defense" is not a single, homogeneous good, not a single lump. It can be one cop or it can be thousands of missiles, aircraft carriers, etc. *How much* defense should be provided? Minarchy can furnish no free-market answer, and therefore the State, *even* to the extent that it is really defending, does enormously too much because the taxpayer is forced to pick up the tab without his consent. (The *taxpayer's* rights are of course *not* being defended — quite the contrary.)

And, as usual with States, disproportionately means virtually infinite step-by-step escalation. For the British, by mid-May, maddened by the gall of Argie aircraft in actually sinking a British destroyer, the H.M.S. *Sheffield*, were planning to bomb the Argentine mainland to get at the pesky air bases. At that point (New York *Post*, May 14), the Reagan Administration became alarmed, and the President threatened to withdraw his support of the British cause if the Brits bombed the mainland. Presumably, this threat brought the war-crazed Brits partially to their senses. For the next step would surely be to get at the damn factories and loading points that supplied the air bases, and ... would we *really* maybe one day see the Brits nuking of Buenos Aires? All over which national rag flies over the 1800 kelpers?

## 2. Freedom of Immigration

Libertarians favor freedom of movement and immigration, and yet few have noticed that it was the migration problem that actually sparked the present conflict.

Some Argies would like to migrate to the Falklands, and the Brits have prevented them from doing so. The present war began when an Argie group of scrap dealers sailed to the island of Leith, in the South Georgias hundreds of miles from the Falklands proper. For libertarian fans of "self-determination," it should be noted that the South Georgias are *uninhabited*, and that therefore there are no kelpers for Brit imperialists to weep crocodile tears over.

The scrap dealers were in Leith temporarily and not permanently, and were sent there by an Argentine scrap dealer named Constantino Davidoff, to dismantle abandoned whaling stations on the island. Davidoff's expedition was perfectly legal, and had been cleared with Britain. After arriving at the island this March, the 43 Argie workmen, perhaps on a drunken impulse, hoisted the blue-and-white Argie flag.

It was then that all hell broke loose. First, a group of crazed kelpers, fanatically devoted to the Union Jack, broke into the Argentine national airline office at Stanley, the little capital of the Falklands, and decorated it with a Union Jack. Three days later, on March 22, the Brits sent the patrol ship *Endurance* and a group of British Marines to forcibly and illegally (even by Brit law) evict the Argies. Quickly, Argentina and Britain escalated the number of warships sent to South Georgia, and a few days later, on April 2, the Argentine invasion, or reconquest, of the entire Falkland constellation — the Falklands themselves, the South Georgias, and the South Sandwich islands (also uninhabited) — was underway.

## 3. How Much Do the Brits Love the Kelpers?

How much do the Brits really love the kelpers? They may be willing to fight, die, and kill to keep the Union Jack flying over 1800 shepherders 8,000 miles from home, but they don't seem to be willing to allow them elemental justice. For example, the kelpers are not British citizens. Since they are not citizens, they are not allowed to emigrate to Great Britain unless their parents or paternal grandfathers were born there. Perhaps if they were allowed to get off that blasted rock, the kelpers would solve the Falkland problem once and for all by emigrating to their beloved Britain and allowing the Argies to peacefully move in.

(Continued on page 5)

# FREE TEXAS, RIP

by Michael Grossberg

(Recently, *Free Texas*, along with California's *Caliber* by far the outstanding LP state newsletter in the country, was eviscerated and its editor, Mike Grossberg, an outstanding party theorist and activist, was ousted from his post. The name *Free Texas* is slated to continue, but its soul and substance is gone. Grossberg has been trying to get his point of view published in the Craniac smear sheet *UpChuck*, which had printed critical material, but without success. We are therefore happy to print Grossberg's case as originally written for *UpChuck*. — Ed.)

Confident that the track record of FREE TEXAS is its own best defense, I wish to offer a rebuttal to certain allegations recently published in *Update*.

FREE TEXAS has been criticized by one letter writer as a "sectarian newspaper" with a "slanted editorial policy in favor of narrow 'ivory tower' libertarianism." Since 1979, when I first volunteered to upgrade FREE TEXAS into a quality outreach tabloid for the Libertarian Party of Texas, the bimonthly newspaper has featured several hundred articles, editorials, investigative reports, interviews, letters, and news stories reflecting a broad diversity of viewpoints within the libertarian movement. During the past two years, FREE TEXAS theme issues have appeared on such "ivory tower" subjects as health care, urban affairs, civil liberties, inflation, education, and regulation.

Under my editorship, FREE TEXAS regularly presented debates between libertarians on a wide variety of current issues, from foreign policy to the Equal Rights Amendment. Typical of my own "sectarian" editorials was a balanced critique of the Clark campaign, which just may be the only such editorial praised by *both* Murray Rothbard and Ed Crane, not to mention Ed Clark himself.

One anonymous Texas activist, quoted in an *Update* news story, charged that "the anarchist viewpoint gets a disproportionate amount of space compared to the limited government viewpoint". A quick glance through the newspaper's back issues reveals the ironic fact that although several articles and letters disagreeing with anarchism were printed, not *one* article disagreeing with minarchism has ever appeared!

FREE TEXAS was also castigated for its so-called "lack of news reporting". Fortunately, there is an objective standard by which to judge such arbitrary complaints: FREE TEXAS itself. Of the over 100 articles published in the newspaper during 1981, 48 of them — almost half — were news stories, largely written by myself, including the most comprehensive News Notes of any LP publication.

Such incredible allegations are obviously contradicted by the facts. But critics of FREE TEXAS go even farther, stooping to a personal attack on my professional ethics by accusing me of "censorship". I am proud of my work as FREE TEXAS editor and want to state for the record that I have

*never* "censored" the ideological content of any FREE TEXAS article — even if it was one of the articles with which I differed. Due to space limitations, I often condensed articles, trying to preserve their "meat" while cutting their "fat". For an objective, if somewhat diverse, test of my relative merits as an editor, why not poll a representative sample of those FREE TEXAS contributors who frequently experienced the editor's "knife": Scott Bieser, Ed Clark, Michael Dunn, Jeff Hummel, Bill Howell, Honey Lanham, Wendy McElroy, AnnMarie Perier, Robert Poole, or Sheldon Richman? My critics are highly disingenuous when they urge *Update's* readers to compare the Randolph interview published in the LPT's 1982 newsletter with the "same" interview in the Winter FREE TEXAS. In reality, as my critics are will aware, that "same" interview is actually two separate Randolph interviews.

Editing a newspaper is impossible without editorial standards; such standards inevitably imply occasional rejection of unsuitable articles. Although I encouraged — an often cajoled — party activists to contribute to FREE TEXAS, my "editor's slushpile" of unpublished submissions (including, in my opinion, the other Randolph interview) amounted to a grand total of 4 articles! In any event, it is ridiculous for Libertarians, of all people, to accuse a private newspaper of "censorship".

My critics also accuse me of "opposition to the ballot drive". If I were opposed to the LPT ballot drive — prerequisite for any Libertarian to run for office in Texas — why would I have invested so much energy finding a gubernatorial candidate and developing a statewide campaign strategy for the LP of Texas? My fulltime work on six LP ballot drives, including all three in Texas, happens to be a matter of public record. Apparently, some people misinterpret my opposition to their own political strategy as a generalized "hostility to successful political action." Yet I have always praised Libertarian successes, as shown by my many articles about the LP and its victories in FREE TEXAS.

Beneath such hollow allegations, I sense an unspoken dissatisfaction among a few party activists, not with any imaginary "absence" of news, but with the very real presence of honest ideology, intelligent debate and principled libertarianism in their state party's newspaper. Their constant reiteration that "FREE TEXAS is alive and well" evades the fact that FREE TEXAS has been altered drastically in content, format, length, editorship, and editorial philosophy. Why would so many libertarians, both in Texas and nationwide, be so concerned about the fate of one state party newsletter — unless its *particular* content and guiding philosophy had succeeded in making it of more than just regional interest?

Contrary to popular report, Texas activists did not face a clearcut budgetary decision between a much less expensive, voluntarily edited newsletter and the FREE TEXAS "status quo". At recent LPT Executive Committee meetings the choice was between two FREE TEXAS proposals of *similar* net cost,

but *different* guiding philosophies. By arguing that the "bottom line" of this controversy was economics, my critics gloss over the real strategic and ideological differences which divide Libertarians in Texas. Politics, not economics, was the real bottom line.

It is not a pleasant task to "wash the dirty linen" of the LP of Texas in public, to express my differences with Libertarians who I have worked with for years and still care for as friends. But the controversy over FREE TEXAS is only one manifestation of a deeper conflict within the Libertarian Party, of vital importance to libertarians everywhere.

Will the Libertarian Party remain a Party of Principle? Can the LP continue to combine both political activism and principled ideology? Or shall the pressing need to transform our culture's wider philosophical context be sacrificed for a naive short-range strategy of "Quick Victory" which, even if "successful", may be doomed to ultimate impotence?

When, after many years as a volunteer for the state party and its newsletter, I became the LP of Texas Publications Director in 1981, I was hired not merely to continue my work on FREE TEXAS, but also to implement a broad program of internal education and ideological outreach — based on an earlier consensus that such a principled strategy of consciousness-raising was indispensable to the LP's ultimate success.

Besides my efforts as FREE TEXAS editor, writer, business manager, layout and art director, and advertising salesman last year, a significant portion of my time (and salary) was devoted to media relations, issues research, office work, literature development and distribution, and organization of the successful Politics of Principle Conference (which generated an unprecedented \$1,100 profit). Yet no mention is made of this important program by my critics. Virtually the entire education outreach program seems to have disappeared down some Orwellian "memory hole", along with any lingering interest in the value of such a strategy. Despite certain efforts to rewrite history, over 110,000 printed copies of FREE TEXAS remain an eloquent reminder of the truth.

I would like to conclude by taking this opportunity to thank all the libertarians who have demonstrated their support for FREE TEXAS over the years. I am also grateful for the efforts of the Independence Pledge, the LPT Execom, and particularly Matt Monroe, who made it possible for FREE TEXAS to continue for so long. Notwithstanding any of our honest disagreements over political strategy, I wish all my friends and co-workers in the LP of Texas nothing but the best. May we all succeed in "Legalizing Freedom!" □

Joseph R. Peden, Associate Editor  
Daniel M. Rosenthal, Publisher  
Dyanne M. Petersen, Associate Publisher  
Carmen Accashian, Circulation Manager

## FUHRIG FOR SENATE

There are many good men and women running for high office in the Libertarian Party this year, but it gives me particular pleasure to give my highest endorsement to Joe Fuhrig, running for U.S. Senate from California.

I have known Joe Fuhrig for years. He is intelligent, cheerful, articulate, and tirelessly energetic, an economics professor ("Austrian" to the core) and a dedicated radical libertarian. (Also, a champion golfer, for those with bourgeois cultural tastes.) But what is more, he enters this campaign a determined anti-statist and abolitionist. Libertarians who are either pragmatic opportunists or anti-party purists are going to be buffaloed by the Fuhrig campaign: For Fuhrig is going to prove, in the process of proving, that one can run a Libertarian campaign and still be a principled libertarian, and an anti-state abolitionist to boot. Fuhrig will hide nothing. There are no hidden principles in his closet, waiting for the "proper time" for our LP politico to spring them upon an unsuspecting voter. What the voters for Fuhrig are going to get, they are going to see right now.

Joe Fuhrig, in short, is a model of what every Libertarian candidate should be. He is running as an honest and untterrified libertarian: out to abolish the State ASAP. Although an economist, he is running on principle, moral libertarian principle, first and foremost.

Here are some samples of Fuhrig on the issues from his campaign brochure, which is subtitled "No Compromise in the Fight for Liberty." On Conscription: "Human beings have a right to control their bodies and live their lives. No person or agency can use the person or life of another. Conscription of ALL types from military service to jury duty is a violent crime." Note how Fuhrig commendably raises and widens the consciousness of libertarians from the draft to jury conscription, which is a similar act of slavery in kind, though not of course in degree. How many other LP candidates have come out against jury slavery, even though this is now in the LP platform?

On taxation, there is no nonsense about "allowing people to keep more of their money." Fuhrig is upfront: "Taxation is Legalized Theft." He goes on: "Human beings have a right to the fruits of their labor and to all the property they can justly acquire in voluntary trade. Tax cuts are not 'gifts' to specific people, they are affirmations of property rights."

On foreign policy, Fuhrig emphasizes nuclear disarmament: "The only way to achieve world peace is to have a nuclear-free world combined with international free trade and cooperation." In his campaign, Fuhrig has come out for unilateral disarmament and that other radical platform plank suppressed by pragmatists at the Denver convention: repudiation of the public debt. Fuhrig also stresses "free immigration": "It is essential that a policy of free trade include a return to a policy of free immigration. Immigration laws inevitably become foreign policy tools used to harm third world peoples."

I have accepted with enthusiasm the offer to become Honorary Chairman of the Fuhrig for Senate campaign. Send

(Continued on page 5)

# ARTS AND MOVIES

by Mr. First Nighter

*Chariots of Fire*, dir. by Hugh Hudson, with Ian Charleson and Ben Cross.

*Chariots of Fire* won the Academy Award last year — and it richly deserves it despite chauvinist grumbling about a British film winning a coveted U.S. award. This is a charming, old-fashioned movie-movie, beautifully acted and photographed, celebrating good old-fashioned values like hard work, dedication, and competition. There is a captivating old-fashioned romance between the Jewish runner, Ben Cross, and the marvelous Alice Krige, and there is no sex or four-letter words in the entire picture — a marvel these days. But is it still possible to portray an old-fashioned romance that does not deal, as does *Chariots of Fire*, with an older and sweeter era? Charmingly, Alice Krige has a delectably round face — another nostalgic note in an age of gaunt and haggard actresses.

The picture employs a fascinating counterpoint of the two Olympic runners who, in fact, were British heroes at the 1924 Olympics. One, a Jewish student at Oxford, angers genteel anti-Semites at the college by being bumptious and challenging aristocratic values by hiring his own track coach — superbly played by Ian Holm. John Gielgud is outstanding as one of the college anti-Semites, muttering behind the arras and trying to get Cross to give up the coach.

Particularly admirable is the Scottish runner, played excellently by Ian Charleson. Dedicated to the Calvinist religion, Charleson, a missionary, runs for the honor of God. The most dramatic scene in the movie comes when the English Establishment, finding that the trial heat for Charleson's race comes on Sunday, tries to get him to surrender his cherished religious principle of not participating in activity on the Sabbath. The British Olympic head, and even the Prince of Wales, use all the standard patriotic arguments, but Charleson stands firm on putting God above the State.

Many critics have gravely misunderstood *Chariots of Fire* by claiming that it celebrates the English imperial Establishment of time gone by. But the obvious sympathy of the movie with the runners as against a bigoted aristocracy and the British State shows that the thrust of the film is quite the reverse. In fact, the best lines of the movie are delivered by the Duke of Sutherland, attacking the various Lords trying to talk Charleson into running on Sunday. The Duke points to the recent bloody and senseless war for the honor of the English State as a reminder of where unthinking devotion to the State can lead.

No, the old-fashioned quality in the movie does not lie in loyalty to State and Empire. It stems from the celebration of values, of dedication and individual integrity, and of older charming styles of movie-making, that have virtually disappeared from the modern cinema.

*Death Wish II*, dir. by Michael Winner, with Charles Bronson and Vincent Gardenia.

No movie in recent times has been vilified by liberal critics as much as *Death Wish*, that magnificent celebration of one man's pursuit of justice in using violence to defend person and property against thugs and killers. The liberal excuse was that the movie exalted "violence." That, of course, is nonsense, since countless pictures wallowing in senseless and brutal violence have received the plaudits of the critical fraternity. The difference is clear: senseless, random violence is OK, since it "reflects the realities of our sick modern society," blah blah. But *purposeful* violence, rational violence so to speak, violence in firm defense of person and property against the aggressive violence endemic in modern urban life, *that* is terrible, evil, and "racist." Particularly when the defensive violence is practiced *not* by the official State apparatus, not by the police, but by one lone man, one previous victim, who gloriously turns that victimization into a triumphant victory over brutal street crime. It was bad enough, for liberals, when Dirty Harry, as a maverick cop, did it, but when a mere *citizen* turns "vigilante," then all liberal hell breaks loose. For it might give all of us ideas.

*Death Wish* was a marvellous, exhilarating movie, almost mythic in theme and stature. Most libertarians enjoyed that movie as no other. I saw that film in a jammed theater, of which the audience was about 95% black, and every time Bronson shot down a mugger or rapist, black or white, the entire audience erupted in a roar of approval. Let upper-class white liberals call the film "racist"; that was hardly the reaction of the black man in the street.

Now *Death Wish II*, the sequel, has appeared, and has received the exact same liberal response. But don't worry, it's a splendid sequel, and those who loved *Death Wish* are bound to cherish this one. If it does not have quite the same paradigmatic and mythic quality, it is still worthy of the original.

Admirers of *Death Wish* will remember the superb final sequence. Bronson, after being expelled from New York for his vigilante activities which had cut the street crime rate dramatically, arrives at the Chicago airport, and immediately sees a mugging taking place. He has no gun on him of course, but he bends over and, his face playing in a happy and triumphant grin, crooks his fingers at the criminal in the familiar sign of a revolver going off.

*Death Wish II* opens in L.A., where Bronson, an architect, has moved after a brief stay in Chicago. Once again, as in the previous film, Bronson's daughter — a mental case from a New York assault — is raped and killed, as is his Filipina housekeeper. Bronson becomes a vigilante once more, and once more the cops, holding formal legality and State monopoly higher than justice and individual rights, are out to stop him. In a fine touch, Vincent Gardenia, a police inspector who tracked down Bronson in New York, is sent out allegedly to help the L.A. police, but actually to hunt down Bronson and

(Continued on page 6)

## FALKLANDS *(Continued from page 1)*

And since the kelpers are not British citizens, they are excluded from top jobs, and are not allowed to purchase very many houses or to buy land. Furthermore, in 1980 Britain was ready to grant sovereignty over the Falklands to Argentina in return for a very long, Hong-Kong like, lease back arrangement that would keep the Brits there *de facto*. Argentina was willing to along with the deal, which was blocked by the Falklanders themselves.

Free the kelpers! Independence for the Falklands! In point of fact, one prominent young kelper is now calling for independence, which we thought had been a lone cry of the *Lib. Forum*. Graham Bound, 24-year old editor of one of Falklands' two monthly newspapers, the *Falkland Islander*, who last year called for independence from Britain. Unfortunately, Bound did not stop there, and wackily suggested that the UN take over the islands and maintain them as an International Wildlife Sanctuary, presumably allowing the kelpers to remain there along with the rest of the wildlife. (see J.H. Evans and Jack Epstein, "The Real Losers Are The Locals," *In These Times*, May 5-11, 1982, p. 22.)

Evans and Epstein, who have actually *been* to the Falklands, supply us with fascinating data about their daily life. The British citizens, working as officials or technicians for the British government, the Falkland government, or the monopoly Falkland Islands Company, receive almost twice the salary as the native kelpers for the same jobs. The Brits all live in the "city" of Stanley, population 1,000. Every part of the island outside Stanley is sheep ranches known as "The Camp." The Camp suffers from a feudal-like social structure, in which the absentee Brit landlords serve as veritable lords of the land who double as justices of the peace and are empowered to baptize and to wed the kelpers.

In Stanley, furthermore, vandalism abounds among the bored and discontented youth. Since there are few single women, "young men habitually drowned their sorrows and frustrations in the five busy pubs." Alcoholism is an "urban" kelper problem. (Evans and Epstein, "A Port That Time Forgot," *ibid.*, p. 9.)

### 4. If the Brits Are Doing All This for the Kelpers, Why Do They Insist on Keeping South Georgia?

The British insist that all this monstrous expenditure of blood and treasure is being done to insure justice for the 1800 kelpers. But if that is the case, why is it that the Brits, in their lengthy UN negotiations before their invasion of the Falklands, insisted that South Georgia shall remain British? And that the British seizure of that island has nothing to do with the Falkland crisis and therefore is not subject to negotiations with the Argies? For South Georgia, as we have seen, is an uninhabited island, and therefore there are no loyal kelpers to mope over. Could it be that Britain is simply interested in maintaining its sovereignty and its Empire, period? □

To force a man to pay for the violation of his own liberty is indeed an addition of insult to injury. But that is exactly what the state is doing.

— Benjamin R. Tucker

## VOLUNTARYISTS ORGANIZE

George Smith, Carl Watner, and Wendy McElroy have organized a new anti-political group of libertarians called The Voluntaryists. The basic purpose of the new organization is to explore nonpolitical strategies to achieve a free society. They claim that one consequence of libertarian political activity is that almost no thought has been given to other ways of broadcasting the libertarian message. The Voluntaryists hope to remedy this oversight.

The term "Voluntaryist" was chosen to identify the group because of its long-standing historical significance in the libertarian tradition. Its roots go back to the Voluntaryist insight formulated in the 16th Century, which claims that all governments must cloak themselves in an aura of legitimacy in order to win the passive acquiescence of their subjects. The Voluntaryists believe that libertarians must seek to dissolve this aura of legitimacy by using nonpolitical methods.

The group has published a number of pamphlets in *The Voluntaryist Series*. George Smith, a long time libertarian and author of the *Atheism The Case Against God* (1974), has written the first in the series. His *Party Dialogue* is a Voluntaryist critique of political action and the LP. Smith is also a frequent lecturer for Cato Institute, The Institute for Humane Studies, and the Center for Libertarian Studies.

No. II in *The Voluntaryist Series* was written by Carl Watner and it deals with his interest in the history of the libertarian tradition. The pamphlet addresses the development of anti-political ideas in libertarian thought, with special emphasis on the controversy about voting in the 19th Century abolitionist movement. Watner has written for *Reason Magazine* and the *Libertarian Forum* and has published numerous articles in *The Journal of Libertarian Studies*.

Wendy McElroy, the third co-organizer of The Voluntaryists, has been active in the libertarian movement for many years. She has recently compiled and published *Liberty 1881-1908*, which is a comprehensive index to Benjamin Tucker's *Liberty*, the most famous of the 19th Century individualist journals. This was facilitated by a grant from the Center for Libertarian Studies. Her lead article in the Autumn 1981 issue of *Literature of Liberty* dealt with Tucker and the individualist movement. Wendy is editor of a forthcoming anthology on individualist-feminism to be published by Cato Institute. She has lectured widely on subjects of interest to libertarians.

"An Introduction" to The Voluntaryists, which includes their Statement of Purpose, may be obtained by sending them a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The Voluntaryists pamphlets are available for \$1.00 each postpaid. Orders and inquiries may be sent to: The Voluntaryists, Box 5836, Baltimore, Maryland 21208.

## FUHRIG *(Continued from page 3)*

whatever contributions you can to the Fuhrig campaign. For information or for sending contributions, the address is: Joe Fuhrig for Senator, 5960 Zinn Drive, Oakland, CA 94611. Phones: (415) 861-2982; (213) 345-3733.

And furthermore, why stop at the Senate? Libertarians everywhere are looking frantically for a Presidential candidate to be nominated in the summer of 1983 at the New York convention. Why not Joe Fuhrig, a Respectable Radical, in 1983-84? Why not Fuhrig all the way? If you contribute to Joe Fuhrig's senatorial campaign now, you might just possibly help put this highly articulate and principled radical in as President in 1983! □



**ARTS AND MOVIES** (Continued from page 4)

even kill him to prevent the New York affair from becoming publicly known.

Gardenia, who fans remember was always snuffing in the first film, has now developed even worse nasal problems, and he is sneezing and coughing throughout the picture.

Bronson's vigilante quest differs from the previous film, for now he got a look at the killers before they knocked him out. And so he sets out, not after random muggers, but to get the rapists and killers of his daughter and housekeeper. In the most dramatic scene in the picture, Gardenia tracks Bronson to a lonely wood, where he comes across our vigilante in a shootout with a half-dozen of the killers. Remarkably, Gardenia jumps in to aid Bronson. In a marvellous confrontation, Bronson, after the shooting is over, goes over to comfort a dying Gardenia.

"Why did you stick your neck out — for me?", Bronson wonderingly asks his old enemy.

"It was either you — or *them*."

At that point, Gardenia asks whether he got the killers. "All but one," Bronson replies.

And then, in one of the great lines in the recent cinema, the expiring Gardenia implores:

"Get the m----- for me!"

Attaboy, Gardenia, and attaboy Bronson, who of course does, in a great scene which manages to blast away at modern "insanity" defenses for violent crime.

Another excellent note is Jill Ireland, Bronson's love interest, a bright lawyer and criminological liberal, who as do so many females in vigilante/spy drama, can't take the gaff when they find that their boy friends are willing to fight and

use violence in defense of right and justice. One thinks immediately of the magnificently tough Matt Helm in the Donald Hamilton spy novels, who is always being abandoned by females *even when* they too are allied spies who are convinced that it is perfectly legitimate for the CIA or whatever to assassinate killers and bad guys.

After the sensitive ending of *Death Wish II*, with Bronson alone and deserted by Jill Ireland, one is left with the question: will our vigilante hero ever find a heroine, a "Rebel Girl," who admires him as vigilante as well as architect and is willing to stick? Let's hope that there will be a *Death Wish III* so we can find out. In the meantime, Michael Winner has produced another *Death Wish* great. □

**ERRATA**

**April, 1982 issue.**

In our lead editorial, "To the Gold Commission," there were five missing lines in the fourth paragraph of the first column of page 2. That paragraph, and the next two lines, in their entirety, should have read as follows:

If we must denationalize gold, then, we must also and at the same time denationalize *the dollar* — taking the issuance of dollars out of the hands of the government or the central bank. To eliminate and exorcise the spectre of inflation, we must see to it that gold, dollar, and money are in the hands of the people, of the free market, rather than the central bank.

How can this be done? How can we establish freedom and private property in money, while denationalizing gold and the dollar? Only by restoring the concept of the "dollar", etc.

**HOW TO SUBSCRIBE TO THE LIBERTARIAN FORUM**

P.O. Box 504, Newtown, CT 06470

- 2 year (24 issues) subscription \$27.00 (save \$3.00)
- 1 year (12 issues) subscription \$15.00

All foreign subscriptions, payment in U.S. dollars only. Overseas subscriptions, please add \$10.00 for extra postage (per year).

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Street \_\_\_\_\_  
 City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_